

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
7 DISTRICT OF NEVADA

8 \* \* \*

9 COREY MATTHEW CAMPANA, Case No. 3:15-cv-00404-MMD-VPC  
10 v. Plaintiff,  
11 ARIAS et al., ORDER  
12 Defendants.  
13

14 This action is a *pro se* civil rights complaint filed pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983 by  
15 a state prisoner. On October 20, 2015, this Court issued an order denying the  
16 application to proceed *in forma pauperis*, without prejudice, because the application was  
17 incomplete. (Dkt. no. 3 at 1.) The Court ordered Plaintiff to file a fully complete  
18 application to proceed *in forma pauperis* or pay the full filing fee of \$400.00 within thirty  
19 (30) days from the date of that order. (*Id.* at 2.) The thirty-day period has now expired,  
20 and Plaintiff has not filed another application to proceed *in forma pauperis*, paid the full  
21 filing fee, or otherwise responded to the Court's order.

22 District courts have the inherent power to control their dockets and “[i]n the  
23 exercise of that power, they may impose sanctions including, where appropriate . . .  
24 dismissal” of a case. *Thompson v. Hous. Auth. of City of Los Angeles*, 782 F.2d 829,  
25 831 (9th Cir. 1986). A court may dismiss an action, with prejudice, based on a party’s  
26 failure to prosecute an action, failure to obey a court order, or failure to comply with  
27 local rules. See *Ghazali v. Moran*, 46 F.3d 52, 53-54 (9th Cir. 1995) (dismissal for  
28 noncompliance with local rule); *Ferdik v. Bonzelet*, 963 F.2d 1258, 1260-61 (9th Cir.

1 1992) (dismissal for failure to comply with an order requiring amendment of complaint);  
 2 *Carey v. King*, 856 F.2d 1439, 1440-41 (9th Cir. 1988) (dismissal for failure to comply  
 3 with local rule requiring *pro se* plaintiffs to keep court apprised of address); *Malone v.*  
 4 *U.S. Postal Service*, 833 F.2d 128, 130 (9th Cir. 1987) (dismissal for failure to comply  
 5 with court order); *Henderson v. Duncan*, 779 F.2d 1421, 1424 (9th Cir. 1986) (dismissal  
 6 for lack of prosecution and failure to comply with local rules).

7       In determining whether to dismiss an action for lack of prosecution, failure to  
 8 obey a court order, or failure to comply with local rules, the court must consider several  
 9 factors: (1) the public's interest in expeditious resolution of litigation; (2) the court's need  
 10 to manage its docket; (3) the risk of prejudice to the defendants; (4) the public policy  
 11 favoring disposition of cases on their merits; and (5) the availability of less drastic  
 12 alternatives. *Thompson*, 782 F.2d at 831; *Henderson*, 779 F.2d at 1423-24; *Malone*,  
 13 833 F.2d at 130; *Ferdik*, 963 F.2d at 1260-61; *Ghazali*, 46 F.3d at 53.


14       In the instant case, the Court finds that the first two factors, the public's interest in  
 15 expeditiously resolving this litigation and the Court's interest in managing the docket,  
 16 weigh in favor of dismissal. The third factor, risk of prejudice to Defendants, also weighs  
 17 in favor of dismissal, since a presumption of injury arises from the occurrence of  
 18 unreasonable delay in filing a pleading ordered by the court or prosecuting an action.  
 19 See *Anderson v. Air West*, 542 F.2d 522, 524 (9th Cir. 1976). The fourth factor — public  
 20 policy favoring disposition of cases on their merits — is greatly outweighed by the  
 21 factors in favor of dismissal discussed herein. Finally, a court's warning to a party that  
 22 his failure to obey the court's order will result in dismissal satisfies the "consideration of  
 23 alternatives" requirement. *Ferdik*, 963 F.2d at 1262; *Malone*, 833 F.2d at 132-33;  
 24 *Henderson*, 779 F.2d at 1424. The Court's order requiring Plaintiff to file another  
 25 application to proceed *in forma pauperis* or pay the full filing fee within thirty (30) days  
 26 expressly stated: "IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that if Plaintiff does not timely comply  
 27 with this order, dismissal of this action may result." (Dkt. no. 3 at 2.) Thus, Plaintiff had  
 28 adequate warning that dismissal would result from his noncompliance with the Court's

1 order to file another application to proceed *in forma pauperis* or pay the full filing fee  
2 within thirty (30) days.

3 It is therefore ordered that this action is dismissed without prejudice based on  
4 Plaintiff's failure to file another application to proceed *in forma pauperis* or pay the full  
5 filing fee in compliance with this Court's October 20, 2015, order.

6 It is further ordered that the Clerk of Court shall enter judgment accordingly.

7 DATED THIS 2<sup>nd</sup> day of December 2015.



8  
9 MIRANDA M. DU  
10 UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28